

Remarks

In the present response, claims 1-13 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 112

Claims 5, 6, and 11 are rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that applicant regards as the invention. Applicants respectfully traverse.

First, the examiner argues that there is no antecedent basis for “posts” as recited in line 2 of both claims 5 and 6. Claim 5 recites “a plurality of posts” and then recites “said plurality of posts.” Proper antecedent basis is thus provided for “said” plurality of posts. Claim 6 recites that two rails are mounted “between adjacent posts” of the frame assembly. The words “said” or “the” are not used in front of the words “posts” because the posts in claim 6 are a new element.

Second, the examiner argues that claim 11 does not provide enough structural explanation (means recited) to accomplish retraction (the function desired). Claim 11 recites that the ramp portion engages the frame assembly to automatically retract a hangar. Support for this claim element is found at least in paragraph [0045] on pages 10-11 in the specification. Furthermore, as expressly stated in the MPEP, “[b]readth of a claim is not to be equated with indefiniteness” (see MPEP 2173.04: Breadth is Not Indefiniteness).

Applicants respectfully request the examiner to withdraw these rejections.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 1, 4, 7, and 10 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 5,993,099 (Greenberg). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 1, 4, 7, and 10 recite elements that are not taught or even suggested in Greenberg. Some examples are provided below for independent claim 1.

As one example, independent claim 1 recites a plurality of hangars provided on opposite sides of the electronic device. By contrast, Greenberg teaches hangars that extend from a file folder, not an electronic device.

Anticipation under section 102 can be found only if a single reference shows exactly what is claimed (see *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985)).

For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over Greenberg.

As another example, independent claim 1 recites that the hangars retract into the opposite sides so the electronic device can fit into the frame assembly. By contrast in Greenberg, the hangars do not retract so the file folder can fit between the rails.

Anticipation under section 102 can be found only if a single reference shows exactly what is claimed (see *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985)).

For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over Greenberg.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 102(b)

Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by USPN 6,209,979 (Fall). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claims 2 and 3 recite elements not taught or even suggested in Fall. Some examples are provided for independent claim 1.

As one example, independent claim 1 recites that the hangars retract into the opposite sides so the electronic device can fit into the frame assembly. By contrast, the hangars in Fall are fixed.

Anticipation under section 102 can be found only if a single reference shows exactly what is claimed (see *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985)).

For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over Fall.

As another example, independent claim 1 recites that the hangars expand from opposite sides of the electronic device. By contrast, the hangars in Fall are fixed.

Anticipation under section 102 can be found only if a single reference shows exactly what is claimed (see *Titanium Metals Corp. v. Banner*, 778 F.2d 775, 227 U.S.P.Q. 773 (Fed. Cir. 1985)).

For at least these reasons, independent claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over Fall.

Claim Rejections: 35 USC § 103(a)

Claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 5,993,099 (Greenberg) in view of USPN 5,967,337 (Fitzburgh). Applicants respectfully traverse.

As explained above, independent claim 1 recites elements not taught or even suggested in Greenberg. Fitzburgh fails to cure these deficiencies. For at least the reasons given with respect to independent claim 1, dependent claims 5, 6, 8, 9, 11, 12, and 13 are allowable over Greenberg in view of Fitzburgh.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicants believe that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

Any inquiry regarding this Amendment and Response should be directed to Philip S. Lyren at Telephone No. 832-236-5529. In addition, all correspondence should continue to be directed to the following address:

Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, Colorado 80527-2400

Respectfully submitted,

/Philip S. Lyren #40,709/

Philip S. Lyren
Reg. No. 40,709
Ph: 832-236-5529